

# Botanical Gazette.

Vol. V.

MAY, 1880.

No. 5.

EDITORIAL.—It is proposed to make our monthly editorials a collection of odds and ends, rather than a short article upon some special subject.

The season has come when hard worked botanists are planning for a summer's campaign. One of the most profitable ways of spending the time is to attend a summer school of botany. One who has never attended such a place cannot appreciate the pleasure connected with the work there. Persons are met with whose tastes are congenial, who can appreciate a devotion to a well loved science without the usual selfish query, "What is it good for?" Fine instruments, a profusion of material, and masterly lectures, make the time pass most delightfully, and the result is a more thorough knowledge of the science of botany than can be gained by half a dozen seasons of ordinary botanical work. The expense of such a summer is exceedingly small, not being half what is so often spent in an aimless jaunting through the country. The editors of the GAZETTE have no axe to grind, but if information as to the methods or expenses in such schools is desired, we will cheerfully give it.

It was a bad slip, on the first line of p. 27, to give the width of the fruit of a *Leavenworthia* as "two inches," when only four lines long. The grossness of the mistake will suggest the correction of inches to lines.

A correspondent refers us to a statement on p. 24, that "all Crucifers have powdery pollen." also to the general statement of the books that wind-fertilized flowers have *dry powdery pollen*, and then wants to know why all cruciferous flowers may not be as readily wind-fertilized as *Pringlea*, and why they need to be entomophilous, since they all have powdery pollen. He should note the difference between "powdery pollen," such as that of the majority of flowers, *Cruciferae* among the rest, and "dry powdery pollen," with light and perfectly incoherent grains, such as that of amentaceous trees, etc., which are particularly adapted to be wafted by the wind. We cannot here turn to it, but we suppose the original statement about *Pringlea* was that it was peculiar in having this *dry* powdery pollen, and thus had an adaptation for wind-fertilization correlated with the abortion of its petals. This seems to solve the riddle propounded. It may be noticed that the article on p. 12, with which all this imbroglio began, speaks merely of "powdery pollen," and therefore the writer on p. 24 rightly remarked that this was true of all Crucifers. Let us hope that at length we have come to the end of the explanation required by the unfortunate article about *Pringlea*.